<u>EXHIBIT V</u>

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK 1 COUNTY OF KINGS: CRIMINAL TERM: PART 27 2 ____X THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK 3 Indict. No. 6825/05 - against -4 ARRAIGNMENT ROY LINDLEY DeVECCHIO and JOHN SINAGRA, 5 Defendants. 6 7 320 Adams Street Brooklyn, New York 8 March 30, 2006 9 B E F O R E : HONORABLE GUSTIN REICHBACH, Justice 10 11 APPEARANCES: 12 13 CHARLES J. HYNES, ESQ. DISTRICT ATTORNEY - KINGS COUNTY 14 for the People BY: NOEL DOWNEY, ESQ. 15 BY: MICHAEL F. VECCHIONE, ESQ. Assistant District Attorneys 16 17 THOMPSON HINE, LLP Attorney for the Defendant 18 One Chase Manhattan Plaza 58th Floor 19 New York, NY 10005 BY: DOUGLAS E. GROVER, ESQ. 20 BY: MARK BEDEROW, ESQ. BY: GINNINE FRIED, ESQ. 21 22 23 Minerva Marin Official Court Reporter 24

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

PROCEEDINGS

COURT OFFICER: All rise, hear ye, hear ye, hear ye. All persons having business before this court, draw near, give your attendance and you shall be heard. Part 27 of the Supreme Court, County of Kings, is now in session, The Honorable Gustin L. Reichbach, Justice, presiding. Be seated and come to order. THE CLERK: Calling calendar -- indictment number 6825 of 2005, Roy Lindley DeVecchio and John Sinagra. You are present? MR. GROVER: Defendant and Defense Counsel is present. MR. GIARAMITA: By Counsel, my client is present, John Sinagra. THE CLERK: As to Mr. DeVecchio, do you know -- have you received a copy of the indictment? MR. GROVER: I did. Appearances, please. THE CLERK: MR. GROVER: My name is Douglas Grover, I'm with the firm of Thompson Hine, One Chase Plaza, New York City. MR. BEDEROW: Also present, Mark Bederow, B-E-D-E-R-O-W. Good afternoon, Your Honor. MS. FRIED: Also present, Ginnine Fried.

Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: Mr. Hines, as to your client,

MM

PROCEEDINGS

1	Mr. DeVecchio, have you received a copy of the
2	indictment?
3	MR. GROVER: My name is Grover. We have received a
4	copy of the indictment.
5	THE CLERK: Do you waive its public reading?
6	MR. GROVER: I waive the public reading of the
7	indictment.
8	THE CLERK: How does the defendant plead?
9	MR. GROVER: Not guilty.
10	THE CLERK: As to
11	MR. GROVER: All counts.
12	THE CLERK: All counts. Thank you.
13	As to
14	THE COURT: We still need their appearances. Let's
15	have the appearances again.
16	MR. GIARAMITA: My name is Joseph Giaramita, 8215
17	Fifth Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.
18	Good afternoon, Judge Reichbach. I represent
19	Mr. Sinagra. I have received the indictment, I waive the
20	reading and enter a plea of not guilty to all counts.
21	MR. VECCHIONE: For the Office of the District
22	Attorney, Michael F. Vecchione.
23	MR. DOWNEY: Noel Downey.
24	Good afternoon, Judge.
25	MR. VECCHIONE: Good afternoon, Judge.
	MM

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Okay, now. Be seated.

Before we proceed with the arraignment, I have received two requests for audio/visual coverage, but before I address those, I want to address the issue of press leaks and the Court's concern for a fair trial.

My only prior involvement with this case was signing a number of Grand Jury subpoenas and, obviously, Grand Jury proceedings are secret and confidential, but when I was presented with these subpoenas by the Assistant District Attorney, he reiterated the sensitivity of the investigation and the need for secrecy, so I was considerably dismayed to see a number of press reports this past week regarding the case. So, I certainly have a general inclination against the imposition of gag orders, but I want to emphasize to all the parties, with particular emphasis to the D.A.'s Office, that the case has got to be tried in the courtroom and not the press.

With that, I will first address these two applications, one is from Tower Productions; is there a representative here from them?

Okay, do you want to state your name for the record?

MS. MILTON: Rachel Milton, M-I-L-T-O-N.

THE COURT: All right, Tower Productions has sought audio/visual coverage because they are involved in, it seems, the preparation of a commercial documentary

PROCEEDINGS

regarding matters of this kind. Notwithstanding that the US Supreme Court has increasingly extended an expanded commercial speech rights, let it be the equivalent of the traditional First Amendment rights, I have a different view under the New York Constitution. So even in the event that I have discretion to permit this type of filming, I wouldn't grant it. That application is denied.

More squarely presented from the First Amendment concerns is an application from WNBC.

Is there a representative here?

MR. DIENST: Yes, Jonathan Dienst, D-I-E-N-S-T.

And WNBC is acting on behalf of all electronic media broadcast and radio in that we have a pool situation whereby, if one camera was allowed into the courtroom, we would film it and distribute it equally to all representatives of the press. We believe this case has extraordinary public interest matters. There have been numerous arraignments in cases, where there is no testimony, where certain judges have allowed cameras in. We believe it's your discretion. We would hope you understand the public interest and would allow the cameras in so that we can present this.

THE COURT: I certainly understand the public's interest. Perhaps, if I had discretion, I might

PROCEEDINGS

seriously consider it. However, I don't know if you have consulted with your Legal Department regarding this matter, but, just this past June, 2005, the New York Court of Appeals and Court TV against the State of New York has squarely addressed this issue and, in rather emphatic terms, have made clear that there is no authority on the part of the Court to grant audio/visual coverage in this matter. That request is denied.

I have also received two applications for the use of still photography, one from Alex Ginsberg of the New York Post and Robert, the Times photographer, here who has put in this request. If he is not here, I guess I don't have to deal with it.

THE WITNESS: I represent the Times, the photographer is not here, but I am a reporter.

THE COURT: You are not in a position to take pictures, in any event?

THE WITNESS: I am not.

THE COURT: Mr. Ginsberg is here from the Post.

MR. GINSBERG: Alex Ginsberg, G-I-N-S-B-E-R-G, New York, 1211 Avenue of the Americas, 10th Floor, 10036.

THE COURT: While the Court of Appeals has been rather emphatic about audio/visual coverage, I think the issue of still photography is not quite as clear; however, this is an -- I appreciate the timing

MM

PROCEEDINGS

difficulties, but this is a last-minute request that I think is appropriate to give both Defense and the District Attorney's Office an opportunity to be heard on this. This is not going to be the last appearance in this case, so I am going to reserve decision on that. I am not going to permit it now. I will set a date in the immediate future where both the District Attorney and Defense Counsel can be present. You can have your attorney there, whoever is going to represent this request, and I will deal with it at that time.

MR. GINSBERG: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right, I guess with those preliminary matters out of the way, we are up to the question of bail.

MR. VECCHIONE: Your Honor, I will be speaking with regards to Mr. DeVecchio. Again, my appearance is Michael F. Vecchione, for the Office of the District Attorney.

Your Honor, quite simply, the District Attorney's Office, on behalf of the People, is asking that the Defendant be remanded.

This Defendant is charged with providing classified secret law enforcement information regarding individuals who had provided information to law enforcement or who are about to provide information to law enforcement on

MM

v Luc

PROCEEDINGS

Gregory Scarpa, Sr., and his organized crime crew, as a member of the Colombo crime family. Scarpa, at that time, in the years that I'm talking about, 1980 through 1992, was a powerful soldier within the Colombo crime family.

After receiving information from this defendant, Scarpa, who is known in mob circles as the Grim Reaper, and his crew executed Mary Bari in 1984, Joseph DeDomenico in 1987, Patrick Porco in 1990, and Lorenzo Lampasi in 1992.

If I may, Your Honor, bear with me, I would like to give a brief synopsis of each of those homicides to the Court:

Our Office, during the course of a long-standing investigation into the link between Mr. Scarpa and the defendant, DeVecchio, uncovered information regarding the murder of Mary Bari who, at the time of her death, was the girlfriend of Colombo Consigliere, Alphonse Persico, who was the brother of Carmine Persico, but then boss of the Colombo crime family.

Several days before the murder of Ms. Bari, Agent DeVecchio, then the head of the Colombo squad of the FBI, warned Scarpa that Bari was talking to law enforcement and he was worried that Bari might tell the FBI about the location of Alphonse Persico who, at the time, was a

MM

PROCEEDINGS

fugitive from federal authorities. DeVecchio instructed Scarpa he must immediately eliminate Bari. Mary Bari was murdered on September 25, 1984, by Scarpa and others associated with Scarpa and the Colombo crime family.

With regards to the murder of Joseph DeDomenico, again, our Office uncovered, during the course of this investigation, a direct link between DeVecchio and the murder of Joseph DeDomenico, who was a made member of the Colombo crime family and an associate of Scarpa, Sr.

I say Scarpa, Sr. because there is a Scarpa, Jr., who is the son of Gregory Scarpa, Sr.

In the Spring of 1986, the then Agent DeVecchio warned Scarpa, Sr. that Joseph DeDomenico could no longer be trusted since DeDomenico was participating in numerous burglaries involving— without involving Scarpa, who were splitting the profits from those burglaries with Scarpa.

Moreover, DeVecchio, he expressed his concern to Scarpa that DeDomenico was overindulging in narcotics and he was dating a woman, at the time, who was a practicing born-again Christian. DeVecchio expressed his fear to Scarpa that DeDomenico may be close to speaking with law enforcement, since he was involved himself now with religion. DeVecchio, he instructed Scarpa, to eliminate DeDomenico.

On September 17, 1987, Joseph DeDomenico was

PROCEEDINGS

murdered by Gregory Scarpa, Jr. and others associated with Scarpa, Sr. and his crew in the Colombo crime family.

The third murder is the murder of Patrick Porco.

Our office uncovered, again, a direct link between DeVecchio and the murder of Patrick Porco, who was a close friend of Scarpa, Sr.'s other son, Joseph.

On Halloween night, as a background to this, on Halloween night, October 31, 1987, an individual named Dominick Masseria, who Mr. Downey will speak about with regard to an individual in the future who is presently under arrest, we will deal with that in a few moments. Dominick Masseria was murdered in a drive-by shooting on the steps of Our Lady of Guadalupe church on 15th Avenue and 72nd Street in Brooklyn, as a result of having been involved in a senseless egg-tossing incident earlier in that evening.

Present in the vehicle from which the fatal shots were discharged were Joseph Scarpa, Gregory Scarpa's son, Patrick Porco, Raymond Aviles or Reyes Aviles, and an individual named Craig Sobel, who is presently under arrest and awaiting extradition in the State of Florida.

In May of 1990, Patrick Porco was interviewed by detectives at the 62nd Precinct stationhouse about the murder of Dominick Masseria. On October 31, 1989,

MM

... •

PROCEEDINGS

several days later, Agent DeVecchio telephoned Scarpa and informed Scarpa that Porco was, in fact, about to inform on Joey, his son. He instructed Scarpa, once again, that something needed to be done with regard to Porco. Scarpa, Sr. immediately instructed his son, Joseph, that Patrick Porco must be killed.

On May 22 -- May 27, 1990, Patrick Porco was murdered by the other defendant in this case, John Sinagra, and Mr. Downey will fill in the details with regards to that.

The last murder with regard to this, to Mr. DeVecchio--

THE COURT: Do the People contend that the other defendant was the actual shooter in that murder?

MR. VECCHIONE: In the Patrick Porco murder, yes, sir.

With regard to the fourth victim, the murder of Lorenzo Lampasi.

Once again, our Office uncovered a direct link between DeVecchio and the murder of Lorenzo Lampasi who, at the time, in 1992, was a soldier on the side of the Vicarena faction of the Columbo crime family. This was a war going on within the Colombo crime family over control of the family. The Vicarena faction against the Persico faction. Lorenzo Lampasi was a member of the Vicarena

PROCEEDINGS

faction.

б

One week prior to May 22, 1992, Scarpa informed

Agent DeVecchio that he wanted to murder Lorenzo Lampasi.

At the time, Scarpa was, as I said before, a soldier in the Persico faction and they were at war with the Vicarena faction. DeVecchio returns several days later, provided the following information: The location of Lampasi's residence, the fact that Lampasi left for work at four a.m., most importantly, in order for Lampasi to leave his driveway, he must open and close a locked gate, thereby, giving opportunity for the murder.

Our Office learned that the information was provided by DeVecchio regarding Lampasi's residence, the time he leaves for work and the presence of the locked gate, and it was obtained through surveillance by other FBI agents who were working on the Colombo war.

On May 22, 1992, Lorenzo Lampasi was murdered in the driveway of his home at four a.m. after he exited his car and attempted to lock the gate. Lampasi was killed by Scarpa, Sr. and others associated with the crime family.

This defendant's motives, Your Honor, were money, quite frankly, in that he received a stipend from Scarpa on a weekly basis and also his desire to feather his own nest within the FBI to rise to greater prominence within the Bureau.

PROCEEDINGS

This case, as the District Attorney said this morning, is one of the worst cases of law enforcement corruption in the history of this country.

The defendant was the head of a squad of FBI agents charged with investigating the Colombo crime family and, as such, was privy to information on the movements of members of the family, their enemies and those who were providing information to law enforcement. This is a strong case with witnesses that range from civilians to FBI agents, to government informants who were members of Scarpa's crew. Thus, the likelihood of conviction, Your Honor, is very high.

In addition, this defendant is a threat to the safety of witnesses in this case who are known to the defendant and to the defense team. As evidenced by these charges and the information we uncovered in this investigation, this defendant, clearly, has no hesitancy in fingering for death individuals who provide information to law enforcement.

During the pendency of this investigation, he had investigators on his behalf, who ID'd themselves as former FBI agents, visit witnesses in an attempt to get information and to intimidate those witnesses. It happened on more than one occasion.

The likelihood--

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Counsel, share with the Court how this intimidation allegedly occurred.

MR. VECCHIONE: The witnesses were visited by the FBI agents, or former FBI agents, claiming to be working on behalf of this defendant, made themselves known, said that they wanted to talk to our witnesses and that the witnesses knew that Lindley was a good guy and that they needed to get on the record the statements of these particular witnesses. The fact that the witnesses were found at the place where they live, Your Honor, to me, is a form of intimidation and—

THE COURT: That would suggest any attempts to investigate or use, as is often the case in this court, former police detectives to do investigations. The mere act of investigating, you're contending, is intimidation.

MR. VECCHIONE: This is during the course of the investigation, when the identity of witnesses were secret.

THE COURT: To me, intimidation means threats or promises of harm to come, not the mere active investigation which seems to me to be not inappropriate.

MR. VECCHIONE: Your Honor, it seems to me if someone were to go to a witness who is secret and essentially say to them that we know where you are, we know that you're a witness in the case, we know who you

MM

PROCEEDINGS

are about to testify against or have testified against and we want to speak to you, Your Honor, that, in the understanding of the particular witnesses involved, was a threat. If Your Honor chooses not to see it as a threat, I would lay it out to the Court that, given the situation that we have here, given the fact that four such informants were killed by Mr. DeVecchio providing information to Scarpa we, in the District Attorney's Office, took it seriously and took it as a threat.

The likelihood that this defendant will flee, Your Honor, is also great. He faces four separate 25 years to life sentences. He has no roots in this community and that he lives in Florida and has never been a native New Yorker.

He has the assets to flee the country and he has friends and associates throughout law enforcement who over the years, Your Honor, I suggest, built up contacts, not only here in the United States, but also internationally who could easily assist him in fleeing.

THE COURT: I'm certainly not discounting the possibility of a flight, but by your own presentation, you've indicated that the defendant has presumably known about this investigation for a period of months that's linking him to these witnesses. Surely, he had an opportunity to flee before an indictment was even issued,

PROCEEDINGS

if that was a real possibility, wouldn't you think?

MR. VECCHIONE: The difference is that there is now an indictment and he now faces those charges. Before, it was the possibility of an indictment, now, the reality of an indictment, the reality of four separate 25 years to life sentences now faces him directly, so there is a change of -- a much different change, and there is a significant change in circumstance.

Your Honor, at this point in time, based on my presentation, I would ask that Mr. DeVecchio be remanded for the murders of Bari, DeDomenico, Porco and Lorenzo Lampasi.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.

Counsel.

MR. GROVER: Your Honor, thank you.

Your Honor, I would like to start out by just apologizing to the Court for Mr. DeVecchio's appearance. He was asked to surrender last night at ten o'clock for a two o'clock court appearance today, an act which I thought was totally unnecessary, but since we were given the courtesy of surrendering and had a week in which to flee in that period of time, I took that courtesy and we showed up at 10 o'clock full knowing, A, he was indicted for four counts of murder.

I don't normally read the New York Post, I read it

PROCEEDINGS

this time. I knew exactly what he was indicted for, I knew exactly who the victims were, I knew exactly who the witnesses were and, in fact, over the last three months, Mr. DeVecchio has known exactly what this is about. He has been up in my office, we have been pulling transcripts from public proceedings relating to each and every one of these homicides because we believe that when these transcripts become public, they will show everyone, a court and the rest of the world, that this is nonsense.

The District Attorney says that they have developed evidence, new evidence that connects Mr. DeVecchio to the homicides. That new evidence is old evidence and it's false evidence. The evidence that they have is the common-law of Gregory Scarpa. A woman by the name of Linda Schiro. Linda Schiro was an FBI informant way back when and she never told the FBI a damn thing. She talked to law enforcement year, after year, after year and never said anything about this and, indeed, when specifically confronted about what do you know about DeVecchio's relationship with Scarpa, her answer was, 'Nothing, I stay out of the kitchen,' and I aniticipate, because I read my Daily News and my New York Post now, I anticipate we are going to hear this woman come into this courtroom and tell us she sat in the kitchen while he talked about She told agents during homicides. Nonsense.

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

PROCEEDINGS

investigations where she was specifically directed to these questions over, and over again, that's the witness.

Mr. Devechio because I think the purpose of being here is to determine whether or not he is a risk of flight.

We knew about this since I got that first phone call from a reporter from a news station back on January 4th or 5th, saying to me, she had been told by someone in the District Attorney's Office that Mr. Devecchio is being investigated for a homicide. He didn't run. Why didn't he run? Because he owns a home that he built in Florida, that's his retirement home, because he has a significant other in Florida, a woman that he has been with for a number of years now who he is not going to run away from, because he has a federal pension, that's what he lives on.

He was an FBI agent for many years and he is retired with a healthy pension that allows him to live in one place and live well in Florida and if he were to run, he would be poor and broke. He would have nothing, because that pension wouldn't continue.

He, indeed, has been doing work. He doesn't just sit around. Some of that work is government work at this present time. Why? Because he is still trusted and the fact that he is trusted is demonstrated by the fact that

PROCEEDINGS

in this courtroom today, you can see there are a number of former FBI agents have come to his defense, have come here to show Your Honor their support for DeVecchio.

One of the things that is important to understand, we are here about bail, we are not here to throw out allegations. Lindley DeVecchio was and always will be a man of the law. He showed up last time full knowing the gauntlet he would receive in the street. He is here full knowing the position that the District Attorney was going to take and he is here because he has respect for the law.

Is he angry? Yes, he is angry. Is he upset about what is going on here and how he is being treated in the press? Yeah. And that may be for another time and another place, but he is certainly not going to walk away from this.

This man, Your Honor, had been a decorated agent during his 33 years in the FBI. He is not just another FBI agent who did his time and graduated the FBI. This was one of the people that really stood out. What do I mean by stand out? In his early years in the 1970s going into the 80s, there was an undercover investigation of an arms' dealer by the name of Edwin Wilson. He received a lot of publicity. At one point, there were threats on the life of a prosecutor, a Southern District prosecutor.

PROCEEDINGS

Mr. DeVecchio went undercover. They pulled him into that because he could play the role. Mr. DeVecchio saved the life of a prosecutor in the Southern District of New York and I for one, as a former prosecutor, respect that.

Mr. DeVecchio was a force on the organized crime squad, Your Honor. The District Attorney of Kings County has no idea what they are getting into when they get into the world of organized crime. They don't make these kinds of cases and they don't know how people act in these kinds of cases and they don't know how to deal with witnesses in these cases.

I would like to tell you, Your Honor, it was in 1980, and the men are here who orchestrated it. The FBI embarked on a mission to take down the five families of New York, the largest organized crime families in the country, and the person who was at the center of that, he is not the only one because many of these people are sitting here in this courtroom. Lin DeVecchio was one of the supervisors that became involved in this effort.

How did he do that? Because he was the supervisor of an organized crime squad, because with Southern District of New York and Eastern District of New York, the families were divided amongst prosecutors to go after these people. Mr. DeVecchio was the case agent for the Commission case. That was the case that took down the

MM

PROCEEDINGS

five heads and the five families tried by Michael Chertoff, President of Homeland Security.

Mr. DeVecchio, in that capacity, was in the center of everything. In that capacity, he also had another very special role. He was responsible for a number of top echelon informants in the FBI. It was his job to contact and deal with these informants while they were providing information for wire taps, while they were providing information about organized crime hijackings, while they were providing information about homicides. When they needed to get information, one of Mr. DeVecchio's roles was to go out there and get it and Mr. Scarpa was one of those sources. Not the only one.

So, during this time, this man played a critical role in that whole process that the FBI, the US Attorney's Office, can take pride in of taking down all those families, and the DA says that in the last few months, while they are conducting Grand Jury investigation and sharing it with all the newspapers, that they have learned that somehow, magically, the guy who is responsible for literally hundreds of convictions, including what we don't hear told, all these people in the Colombo family are convicted and doing time.

So these squads convicted these people with the help of the US Attorney's Office and he played a critical

PROCEEDINGS

role. All of his colleagues, his friends, his superiors, they are here because they know what he was truly about.

THE COURT: Counsel, one obvious concern is that the defendant is not a resident of New York.

MR. GROVER: That is correct. Certainly, I have submitted papers to Your Honor. I told you where he lives. He has a home in Sarasota. It's his primary asset in his life. He sold a home in Dumont, New Jersey and moved to Florida some years ago and is fortunate to own that home free and clear. As I explained in my papers, nevertheless, he has a very stable life. He has people around him who support him emotionally and, as I said, he can't go anywhere, this is his life and his life is about his work and the fact that he has been tarnished with this is something that he can't run away from.

THE COURT: I appreciate what you're saying. On the other hand, the charges here are as serious as can be. So the fact that he might face penury on the run may be preferable to a jail sentence in this case. So the fact that that's not necessarily dispositive, as I say, during the pendency of this case, should he not be incarcerated, where is he going to live?

MR. GROVER: I will give you a number of alternatives, Your Honor. I would propose that he be able to live at his home in Florida. If Your Honor wants

1.0

PROCEEDINGS

him, or Your Honor wants to arrange for some form of reporting or wearing a bracelet or something blocking that, I think we could live with that but, Your Honor, I don't think that's appropriate, given the plausity of evidence in this case and that was the part that I wanted to get to.

He is not running because every one of these counts that are alleged and they are serious and, frankly, reading some of them, they are awful, but he had nothing to do with them. And the way the District Attorney is trying to drag Mr. DeVecchio in is by having a witness come in and say that they overheard some conversation or that Gregory Scarpa, who is an admitted hire, who has told people multiple stories about his sources of information, including the Police Department, including the District Attorney's Office in Brooklyn, this fellow, Scarpa, would say anything to anybody and, Your Honor, as you become more familiar, you will see, whenever he wanted to kill somebody, the best excuse was, he is an informant.

You are going to learn -- we are all going to learn, that Mary Bari was not an informant. So, if the cookie jar is empty, you can't spill it. There is no way that anything was leaked or done, and if you listen to the testimony, if you read the testimony--

MM

Imony, ir you .

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Counsel, I let the District Attorney perhaps go on a little long, too. I am not here trying the case.

MR. GROVER: I appreciate that. Let me tell you what I propose. This is what I sincerely believe. Your Honor, in the courtroom today are a group of former FBI agents. I asked if there would be a group of them that would be willing to sign a recognizance bond on his behalf. I didn't know what kind of response I would get in that request.

As I am sitting here right now, I have 45 names, I believe, 45 names of former special agents of the FBI, none of these gentlemen I would call wealthy men, they are respected men, men in their community who come forward and would be willing to sign a bond because they feel so strongly on two issues. One, that Lin DeVecchio will return to this courtroom when he is required and, two, that Lin DeVecchio would never do anything to harm a witness, which was ludicrous the way that was presented by the Assistant District Attorney.

These people are willing to go to bat for him and these people would not be in this courtroom if that were not the case. They are not here simply out of friendship, they are here because they respect him, they know what he did, they know what kind of person he is,

PROCEEDINGS

and they know that when he gives his word, he keeps it.

That's what the critical issue is and if Your Honor is concerned about what he is going to say, if I had to tell this Court he would stay in my house three blocks from this court house, I would do that, if that's what the Court wishes, but I don't see the difference if he is in his house in Florida and if he has to call in and report.

THE COURT: It might make a difference, if he's got a bracelet on where he is.

MR. GROVER: May I have a moment?
(Brief pause.)

MR. GROVER: Your Honor, if it can be accomplished, I think it's unnecessary here, but if that's what it would take, then that's what I would propose, or at least go along with, Your Honor. I don't think it's necessary. Again, I point to the people that are willing to sign on as his co-guarantors in some way. Reading the bail act, of course, the risk of flight is the critical question and there are many different ways in which bail can be achieved.

THE COURT: I'm aware of the permutations and I'm certainly happy to consider them.

I also have to, and I agree, the critical ingredient is the risk of flight, but factored into the risk of

MM

PROCEEDINGS

flight is the seriousness of the charges and here we can be talking about more serious charges.

MR. VECCHIONE: I would like to add one more thing, Your Honor. Mr. Grover seems to think the District Attorney's Office doesn't know what they're doing and I take umbrage with that.

The second thing I would like to say is Mr. Grover talks about this investigation in which he believes or says that witnesses said certain things and took positions, I believe he quoted from one of them.

I would like to tell Your Honor that, during the course of this investigation, we uncovered evidence that Mr. DeVecchio tampered with the witnesses in that investigation. We have witnesses who are the go-between between Mr. DeVecchio and the witnesses who were investigated by the OPR, which is the Office of Professional Responsibility and, in fact, shaped that testimony during the course of several meetings with this go-between.

In addition, Your Honor, the OPR investigation, which was conducted openly, questioned by a federal prosecutor who is now the general counsel of the FBI, to such an extent and she said that the OPR investigation was itself corrupt, to such an extent that the original OPR investigation was going to be investigated itself

MM

PROCEEDINGS

because of what was--

THE COURT: Was going to be?

MR. VECCHIONE: Yes, it was not because

Mr. DeVecchio was allowed to retire and leave the employ

of the FBI.

So to hold up -- in addition, one other factor is that we have been contacted by Senator Grassley, who has indicated he sits on a committee, a senate committee, that oversees federal funding to the FBI and is interested in getting information regarding this OPR investigation.

In addition, Your Honor, the person who referred this to us, Congressman Delahunt, from Massachusetts, sits on the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and is also going to look into the matters that are part and parcel of this indictment.

This is not something that anybody takes lightly. We do not bring law enforcement people into court because that, at just at the whim of the District Attorney or the whim of witnesses, we have tested this case, we have gone ahead and done every single thing that's necessary to bring it to a Grand Jury and a Grand Jury heard 30 witnesses over the course of several months and returned these indictments. So for Mr. Grover to make light of this, to call me ludicrous in my statements, I believe is

PROCEEDINGS

an injustice.

1.

THE COURT: I actually did not hear Defense Counsel making light of it. I think he adequately addressed the seriousness of it. Obviously, there is a big factual dispute, which I am not going to resolve at this moment.

MR VECCHIONE: Can I say one other thing?

Mr. Grover also indicated that in the last week or so, Mr. DeVecchio knowing about this, could have left, well, he had press and photographers, essentially, camped outside of his door. People were there every single day. There was nowhere for DeVecchio to go.

THE COURT: Counsel, with all respect, that might have been true last week, it wasn't true back in January when apparently the Defense was first informed of this.

MR. VECCHIONE: There were photographers who took pictures of Mr. DeVecchio outside of his home early on in this investigation. There were people who were seeking to get statements from him, knocking on his door all during the course of this investigation.

THE COURT: You're not stating the last three months he was under 24 hour surveillance?

MR. VECCHIONE: Of course not. Where was he going to go? The Defense knows that that was in fact the case because they commented on it.

THE COURT: Counsel, if you are saying he had

PROCEEDINGS

nowhere to go in January, where is he going to go now?

MR. VECCHIONE: That presumes that the press and the photographers will still be camped at his door. Your Honor, we certainly can't depend on the press and photographers to do the job of making sure that this defendant returns to court each and every time.

THE COURT: I agree.

MR. VECCHIONE: I tell you, Your Honor, that the assembled FBI agents who are here provide a network to allow this individual to leave this country, that is what they are here for.

MR. GROVER: Your Honor, we must have thousands of years of service to the government of the United States sitting in this courtroom. For the District Attorney of Kings County to suggest that they would participate in any way on behalf of any defendant in any case in a way that would be suggested to be inappropriate is truly disgraceful. Your Honor, these people have dedicated their lives to their country working in the FBI, many are former military men. These are guys who used to work 24 hours a day in pursuit of what they were doing. These are people that took down the mob. They don't take this lightly, and for them to agree, 45 of them to agree that they would sign on behalf of Mr. DeVecchio, they don't take lightly because they know the consequences. They

PROCEEDINGS

know what it means to forfeit a bond. That's been their business for many years to chase after people.

So, Your Honor, my request is that Mr. DeVecchio came here, six days after learning that this indictment had been filed and after we have been hearing about this in the press, he traveled to New York. He certainly could have traveled somewhere else, but he came to my offices some time ago. Mr. DeVecchio will come back whenever he is needed and I think that, under these circumstances, this is a case that cries out for unusual These crimes are years and years ago. They are from the testimony of witnesses that have changed. is clear and unequivocal testimony from convicted murderers who confessed to the very crimes that are the basis of this, such as Lampasi.

THE COURT: I'm not sure that makes him any more credible than the incredibility you are attributing to the People's witnesses.

MR. GROVER: The only thing I can say about Carmine Sessa is that Carmine Sessa testified in half a dozen federal trials, testified against many number of people, all of whom are convicted, and these people are doing life sentences because of the testimony of this guy who made an agreement with the government to testify. He cooperated. In fact, if you don't have the time, and I'm

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS

not suggesting Sessa told the story of the Bari murder, that was gratuitously given up when he was being debriefed. He was not arrested on that. The testimony that these people gave was used to put people in jail in the Eastern District of New York. I might add, Your Honor, that this indictment is an attack on all of that testimony and those convictions.

This is what is going on here with an agent who had a relationship with an informant who was providing information to the FBI. There are people, sinister people, who are using that in order to get people out of prison and this is step one. They tried it in front of Judge Weinstein in numerous motions, they were all denied. Judge Weinstein said all hearsay that came out of Scarpa, nonsense. It can't be believed.

Judge Weinstein met many of these witnesses, including the witness that we heard today, something about getting paid monthly. We think we know where that comes from, that comes from Gregory Scarpa, Jr. His testimony was dismissed completely. Why? Because being convicted of murder in front of Judge Raggi in Eastern District of New York, he came in and testified on behalf of Vicarena, Jr. The boss of the family, he told the Judge he had never committed any homicide. He told the Judge that—

2,4

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Counsel, we don't have to review—
MR. GROVER: I beg your forgiveness. I'm proposing
we have people that are willing to bat for this
gentleman. Your Honor, this means a lot to him. It
means a lot to them, and I would ask that if we could
create a recognizance bond with all of these gentlemen
signing on his behalf, that would be a fair way to insure
that he would return to this court when necessary.

MR. VECCHIONE: can I say one last thing?

Mr. Grover raised another issue with regard to Judge Weinstein and uses that somehow as something in favor of Mr. DeVecchio. I would like to just quote from Judge Weinstein two sentences in his decision involving Vicarena versus the United States in Pasquale Amado against the United States, and he says as follows:

"DeVecchio proved the far less credible witness whose memory lapses were not believable. That he had largely inadvertently fallen under Scarpa's spell and furnished him with some warnings to protect Scarpa personally and, as a source, is likely."

I don't know how that supports the position that Mr. DeVecchio's -- the charges against him have inverted in other parts and that he has been cleared.

As to the other defendant, Mr. Downey?

MR. DOWNEY: Good afternoon, Judge.

PROCEEDINGS

Judge, Mr. Vecchione alluded to two incidents, I would like to repeat them quickly.

Back in Halloween of 1989, this was a drive-by shooting on 15th Avenue in front of Our Lady of Guadalupe church. On that evening Dominick Masseria was tragically struck down. The drive-by shooting was done by a white limousine. Inside of that white limousine was Ray Aviles, the driver, Joseph Scarpa, the son of Greg Scarpa, Sr., as well as Patrick Porco and Craig Sobel.

During the course of the investigation that I undertook, we were able to apprehend Craig Sobel. During the course of our investigation, we were able to uncover evidence against Craig Sobel, who now stands in custody in Florida, and Dominick Masseria's family is present here in court today, Judge.

During the course of that investigation into the death of Dominick Masseria, Reyes Aviles surrendered in days, pled guilty to Manslaughter in the First Degree and was sentenced to three-and-a-half to ten-and-a-half years.

Judge, in an effort to apprehend Craig Sobel back in 1989, the detectives of the 62nd Precinct attempted to obtain additional information and they brought Patrick Porco down to their precinct and, as you have heard from the earlier arguments this afternoon, Patrick Porco was

MM

PROCEEDINGS

interviewed by those detectives. Agent DeVecchio lead that information to Scarpa and Patrick Porco was killed during Memorial Day weekend, May 27, 1990.

That's why John Sinagra stands before you today, because when it comes to John Sinagra and John Sinagra and the Mafia, John Sinagra is the ultimate want-to-be who could never be, because he was not 100 percent Italian. He tried desperately to become a part of Greg Scarpa's crew by marrying his niece, by essentially developing a lucrative narcotics business out of his bagel store on Nostrand Avenue and Avenue P. The one thing that would hurt him over the top is killing for Greg Scarpa, Sr, and that's what he did during Memorial Day of 1990.

Judge, during the course of this investigation, we come to learn that John Sinagra was the trigger man in killing Patrick Porco upon the orders of Greg Scarpa, Sr. which, of course, as you have come to learn in an argument today, was leaked by Agent DeVecchio.

Judge, in that evening, Patrick Porco sat in the rear seat of John Sinagra's vehicle and when the time was right, John Sinagra turned around with a handgun and pumped some five rounds in the head of Patrick Porco, later to dump him, his body, like a piece of trash on the corner of West First Street and Village Road South here

PROCEEDINGS

in Brooklyn.

Judge, I'm asking you to remand this defendant during the course of these proceedings. The reasons are as follows:

First: The violence of this crime. I've just explained that to you.

Secondly: John Sinagra has absolutely no contacts with New York. He currently resides in Las Vegas. He was apprehended by the Criminal Apprehension Team of the Las Vegas Metro Police in conjunction with the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office detectives.

Additionally, he is a cab driver out in Las Vegas and, my understanding, has no family ties.

Judge, I ask you, again, to remand him.

MR. GIARAMITA: Your Honor, good afternoon. I represent John Sinagra.

My question, respectfully, is why did they wait so long to arrest him if they had that information? He has never been charged with narcotics out of a bagel store. I remember when he had that bagel store, it was a small store and he was never charged with any dealing of narcotics. I am not aware of any reason why they would wait so long if they had evidence that he had committed a murder and to let him go. Do you understand? They are saying that this happened in 1990, he left New York in

PROCEEDINGS

1992.

б

When he left in 1992, he was -- he never moved from anywhere after arriving in Las Vegas. He worked as a limousine driver, now he's been there after as a dispatcher. He lives with his two-year-old son and his fiance. He has never moved. Yes, he is married to somebody, it doesn't make him a criminal. I've been speaking to his family throughout.

THE COURT: Obviously, one concern of the Court, in addition to the seriousness of the charges, is his lack of contacts with the jurisdiction.

MR. GIARAMITA: I understand, Your Honor. He lived in New York most, from what I recall, for many years prior to going to Las Vegas, but he didn't go to Las Vegas right after this happened. We are talking at least over two, three years after the crimes of which he is being charged. Those crimes, in addition, are 16 years ago.

If the Court would allow me to try to put something together to allow him to remain free, we would like that opportunity. Why? Because, as you can see, this case is going to be very highly contested and controverted. This case, he will be in jail for a long, long time if they had the evidence that he was doing drug dealing.

THE COURT: While that's not the Federal Court, the

PROCEEDINGS

case will not languish for a long time, that you can be sure.

MR. GIARAMITA: I'm not aware, you know, my point is, I believe there will be a trial. I don't believe this will be a plea. I do believe it will go for a protracted period of time. He does need medical attention. He has very high cholesterol. They took his medication away from him. He also needs Zoloft.

I knew Sinagra since he had the cash register

business and when he had the bagel store. If you know

people that are bad people, that doesn't make you a bad

person unless you do something wrong. If he did

something wrong, I haven't heard why they had to wait for

16 years to go and arrest him. I understand that there

was a protractive investigation involving the defendant.

He doesn't know him, he doesn't have anything to do with

him. They are seeking — he is going to fight this case.

He is not pleading guilty.

THE COURT: How much time do you feel you need to put together a proposal for bail?

MR. GIARAMITA: Well, Your Honor, I would like to speak -- if I can get some type of agreement with the District Attorney, I would work as soon as possible.

THE COURT: I would disabuse you of the hopes that you are going to get a deal on bail with the District

PROCEEDINGS

Attorney. I thought you indicated you wanted some time to attempt to put together some sort of bail package?

MR. GIARAMITA: I think I can. I have spoken to his fiance's mother, who lives in California. They are interested in helping. I have to go back to the family. I have only gotten this call two days ago and I was able to get into the case, but I have no — I had no information on this case until I read the newspapers. I'm trying to get information as we're going along. I haven't even had a chance to interview him until he was sitting at this table today. I would like to have the opportunity to try to put something together, Your Honor, until you reserve decision on that basis.

because he is before the Court and the Court has to deal with his custody. I am going to remand him and if you want to notify the Court and the District Attorney at a mutual convenient date to make a further bail application, you can do that.

MR. GIARAMITA: I would like for you to revisit it before Your Honor as opposed to another judge because I believe that--

THE COURT: Counsel, don't worry, it's my case.

MR. GIARAMITA: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I didn't know.

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: That's all right.

MR. GIARAMITA: I had very little time to get in touch with the people involved in this case and I haven't had the opportunity to be able to flush that out, but I thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. You can let the District Attorney and Chambers know, meanwhile, the Defendant, Sinagra, will be remanded.

Obviously, the Court has a great deal of concerns. The allegations in this indictment are shocking and I certainly agree with the District Attorney's statement that he made reference to, with one caveat, I believe you said this is the most shocking case of law enforcement The caveat I would add is that I agree, if proven, that's yet to be done and the defendant certainly is entitled to the presumption of innocence, as are all defendants before the Court.

On the other hand, Counsel, you can't get more serious than the allegations here and the Defendant does not have deep ties, at least anymore, to the New York area.

On the other hand, I don't accept the People's position that the facts that the Defense seeks to interview witnesses is tantamount to witness intimidation and, obviously, if there are any allegations presented to

MM

1 2

3

4 5

б

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

the District Attorney, they will, I'm sure, bring those allegations to the Court's attention and it will certainly cause the Court to revisit the issue of bail.

What I'm going to do in terms of the Defendant,
DeVecchio, is set a partially secured bail bond. The
bond will be in the sum of one million dollars to be
secured by the sum of \$100,000 to be, as I said,
partially secured by \$100,000 and to have five sureties
in addition to the defendant, sign the appropriate
affidavits, making them each jointly and severally liable
for the balance of the million dollars bond.

MR. GROVER: Your Honor, I confess some ignorance on this subject. What precisely is it that we need to do today to have Mr. DeVecchio released in terms of the Court?

THE COURT: You have to come up with \$100,000.

MR. GROVER: I have that in escrow.

THE COURT: You have to have five reputable people--

MR. GROVER: I think I can do that five times over.

THE COURT: Sign the affidavit where each of them become jointly and severally liable for the \$900,000 differential between the million dollars and the \$100,000 bail.

MR. GROVER: I will submit that.

THE COURT: Also, most importantly, I am going to

MM

· 7 · 8

PROCEEDINGS

require an electronic monitoring. The Court's concerned where that monitoring is going to be. Obviously, I would be much more comfortable if the defendant was able to be in the New York area so the Court can follow that monitoring as closely as it would like.

Obviously, since there are going to be issues of consultation with Counsel, so he is not going to be —

I'm not requiring him to be 24 hours a day in the house for the monitoring purposes. What I would require is for you to submit a schedule to the Court on a weekly basis indicating where he will be in terms of counsel meetings, and the like, medical appointments, whatever else, so that the monitoring company can be notified as to when he will be on the monitor and off the monitor.

MR. VECCHIONE: May I add something? I would also ask the Court, as a condition, two conditions of the bail and that is, one, a bail source hearing if in fact the bail or the bond is presented to Your Honor and the second is that Mr. DeVecchio surrender whatever valid passport he has.

THE COURT: I was getting to the passport.

MR. GROVER: We brought the passport, that's not an issue.

I'm still not sure if I understand the logistics.

Is this a document that is being created by a court clerk

MM

PROCEEDINGS

that people will sign?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GROVER: As to the \$100,000, since I have \$240,000 in escrow, can I have 24 hours?

The money belongs to Jay DeVecchio, that's his brother. I would have to make arrangements to release that escrow from my firm. Since the bank will be closed shortly, chances are I can't handle the transaction till tomorrow. I can assure the Court that that money is in escrow and that it's from Mr. Jay DeVecchio and I have the paperwork to back that up.

MR. VECCHIONE: I just want to say I will be available tomorrow morning if Mr. Grover wants to come to our office with all of the necessary paperwork and allow us to look at it.

Perhaps we can come to some agreement that the security is in fact sufficient and that it doesn't come from funds that were gotten from Mr. Scarpa or any other illegal activities, and if that's the case, then we will perhaps avoid a hearing on this issue and may very well come to an agreement.

MR. GROVER: Judge, what I want to try to determine is whether or not we can manage to have Mr. DeVecchio go home today. I am representing to the Court, as an officer to the court, that Jay DeVecchio is a partner.

MM

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: This is what I'm going to do: We will have the papers prepared, you can have the five additional sureties sign today so they are on the hook as well as the defendant. I will give you till --

Step up for just a moment.

(A discussion was held off the record.)

the Court: All right, what I'm going to do is set a bail source hearing for 9:30 tomorrow morning. It's my understanding that Defense Counsel and the Court will go to the District Attorney's Office this afternoon with whatever documentation it has to satisfy, hopefully, the dis — after the District Attorney sources the money and, assuming it's okay, you can call my chambers and let me know it's approved so we won't have to proceed, and if there is a problem, we will have a bail source hearing at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

MR. VECCHIONE: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I need the defendant's passport. I am now -- Mr. DeVecchio, in addition to these bail requirements, not all of which we have finalized, I am also advising you that you have a right to be present at the trial, however, should you fail to appear in court on the date that is set for trial, the trial will proceed in your absence, and if the trial proceeds in your absence, you will be giving up your right to consult with your

PROCEEDINGS

attorney during the course of the trial. You will be giving up your right to observe the witnesses against you, you will be giving up your right to testify on your own behalf, should you choose to do so. You will further be giving up the right to address the Court at the time of sentencing, should you be convicted; do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Given the lateness of the hour, what I am -- I am going to release the defendant until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning to give; that is, assuming all the other paperwork is completed to give the defendant an opportunity to post \$100,000.

MR. GROVER: Your Honor that check is made payable to the clerk of the court?

THE COURT: I don't know, I don't get the check, so you better talk to the clerk.

MR. GIARAMITA: One thing briefly. My client's fiance, I have been in contact with, they have two homes in Las Vegas.

THE COURT: You are telling me they have the homes?

MR. GIARAMITA: I want to put that together, I want to know if I can present that information to you by tomorrow at the time of that court appearance.

THE COURT: You can do it on Monday if you wish.

MM

PROCEEDINGS

Realistically, Counsel, you really think you are -1 going to have that all put together in that short period 2 of time? 3 MR. GIARAMITA: I will do my best. 4 THE COURT: Okay, do your best. 5 MR. GIARAMITA: You want to put it on for Monday? 6 THE COURT: Yes. 7 Thank you very much. MR. GIARAMITA: 8 THE CLERK: Your Honor, defendant and attorney have 9 executed Parker warnings. 10 THE COURT: Is there anything else? 11 MR. VECCHIONE: No, sir. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 1.3 Wait, of course, there is something else. We now 14 have to talk about our next court appearance and the 15 substance of the case. 16 I suspect I know the answer to this question, but 17 being obliged to ask, is the District Attorney going to 18 proceed by open file discovery in this matter? 19 MR. VECCHIONE: No, Your Honor, motions. 20 THE COURT: How much time do you need for your 21 motions? 22 MR. GROVER: 30 days. 23

THE COURT: Given that this is an X indictment, I assume, well, let me not assume anything.

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

Any property seized during the course of these 1 arrests? 2 MR. VECCHIONE: No, sir, you mean from the 3 defendant? 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 MR. VECCHIONE: No, sir. 6 THE COURT: Any statements made? 7 MR. VECCHIONE: No, sir. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So far, I suspect there won't be 9 anything by way of Wade hearings or Mapp hearings or 10 Huntley hearings or anything like that? 11 MR. VECCHIONE: That's correct. 12 THE COURT: So we will probably--13 I'm anticipating a lot of problems MR. GROVER: 14 here, Judge. I'm not anticipating an easy road. 15 believe there is going to be a Kastigar Hearing. I think 16 there may be a due process hearing relating to the way 17 the Grand Jury was conducted, the fact that we were aware 18 of all of this. 19 If there was Brady material and whether or not this 20 was entirely presented to the Grand Jury fully 21

If there was Brady material and whether or not this was entirely presented to the Grand Jury fully understanding the limitations of the argument and I think that in this case, it may have risen well beyond that.

22

23

24

25

I'm not going to argue the point, I'm just alerting
Your Honor to the issues. I suggest on motions that we

PROCEEDINGS

have 60 days to file motions. I do not anticipate, simply, discovery motions, there certainly will be more motions. I anticipate a lengthy submission of motions in this case.

MR. VECCHIONE: We attempt to file a voluntarily disclosure form in 15 days, perhaps from there,
Mr. Grover will want to, so he knows, that he can at least wait for that and perhaps file motions dependent upon what information is in the voluntary disclosure form.

THE COURT: Somehow, I don't think that will circuit much motion practice.

MR. VECCHIONE: I don't think so either, but it might focus the motion practice.

THE COURT: I will give you till May 1st, Counsel.

So defense motion is by May 1st, People's response
by May 15th.

MR. VECCHIONE: Your Honor, can we have a little more than two weeks, perhaps a month?

MR. GROVER: While we're haggling dates, I would ask ask for a little more time than four weeks given what we have to deal with. I don't object to Mr. Vecchione having the appropriate response time as well.

THE COURT: You would have taken a different position had I set a different bail?

PROCEEDINGS

MR. GROVER: I would, Your Honor, but I do appreciate the Court's position on this. 2 THE COURT: Step up for a moment. 3 (A discussion was held off the record.) 4 THE COURT: Okay. The defense motion is by May 5 15th, People's response by June 12th and we will have 6 arguments on the motion June 26th. 7 MR. GROVER: What date did you say oral argument? 8 THE COURT: June 26th. 9 MR. GROVER: I don't -- can I beg the Court's 10 indulgence? If we can do that before the 20th, I would 11 appreciate it. I will be leaving the country. 12 THE COURT: Well, it only takes me a week to absorb 13 what I suspect will be voluminous papers. 14 MR. GROVER: Then some time in July, after July 15 10th? 16 THE COURT: As I said, I would rather do it sooner 17 than later. 18 June 19th. 19 Okay, we're adjourned. 20 THE COURT: On the record, a further bail 2.1 application, April 6th. 22 MR. GIARAMITA: How is the 5th? 23 THE COURT: April 5th. 24 MR. GIARAMITA: Thank you, Your Honor. 25

MM

PROCEEDINGS

1 THE CLERK: Will all six please, raise your right 2 Do you solemnly swear to the truthfulness of the 3 affidavits that you have just executed? 4 (Collective response.) 5 THE WITNESSES: I do. 6 THE CLERK: Sir, state your name for the record? 7 MR. TAYLOR: Brian Taylor. 8 Jeffrey Doyle. MR. DOYLE: 9 MR. STEVENS: Lewis Stevens. 10 James Kossier. MR. KOSSIER: 11 MR. MATTESE: Christopher Mattese. 12 MR. DeVECCHIO: Roy Lindley DeVecchio. 13 THE COURT: Do each of you understand that should 14 the bail be forfeited here, each of you individually, as 15 well as collectively, will be on the hook for \$900,000? 16 (Collective response.) 17 THE WITNESSES: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right, bond is approved. 19 (Collective response.) 20 THE WITNESSES: Thank you. 21 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION 22 I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of 23 the proceedings. 24 MINERVA MARIN 25 Official Court Reporter

EXHIBIT W

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 1 of 52

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	Abooos
	-X •
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK	: AFFIDAVIT IN OPPOSITION : TO PETITION FOR REMOVAL
-against-	: CR-06-235
R. LINDLEY DeVECCHIO,	: Kings County Indictment: Number 6825/2005
Defendant.	2
STATE OF NEW YORK)	42
) ss: COUNTY OF KINGS)	

ANN BORDLEY, having been duly sworn, deposes and says:

- I am an assistant district attorney in the County of Kings. I am admitted to practice in this Court and in the courts of New York State.
- 2. This affidavit is submitted in opposition to the petition for removal, dated April 7, 2006, of R. Lindley DeVecchio (hereinafter "defendant"). The statements herein are made on information and belief, based on the records and files of the Kings County District Attorney's Office and the grand jury minutes in this case.
- 3. On February 1, 2005, the Kings County District Attorney's Office received a letter suggesting that defendant was involved in the murder of Nicholas Grancio on January 7, 1992, in Brooklyn, New York. At the time of the murder,

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 2 of 52

defendant was a special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (hereinafter "F.B.I."). Defendant has since retired from the F.B.I.

4. The District Attorney's Office commenced an investigation. The District Attorney's Office was not able to substantiate the allegation that defendant was involved in the Grancio murder. However, during the course of the Office's investigation, the Office uncovered evidence of defendant's participation in the murders of four other individuals: Mary Bari, Joseph DeDomenico, Jr., Patrick Porco, and Lorenzo Lampasi.

The Grand Jury Presentation

5. From December of 2005 to March of 2006, the District Attorney's Office presented evidence to a grand jury sitting in Kings County. The grand jury evidence established the facts set forth below in paragraphs 6 to 46.1

 $^{^1}$ Under New York law, grand jury proceedings are secret. See N.Y. Crim. Proc. Law § 190.25(4); N.Y. Penal Law § 215.70. But the People have obtained a written order from Justice Gustin L. Reichbach, the state judge assigned to this case, granting the People permission to summarize the grand jury testimony in this answer and to provide the grand jury minutes to this Court for its in camera review.

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 3 of 52

The relationship between defendant and Scarpa

- 6. Gregory Scarpa, Sr., was a "made" member of the Colombo crime family. During the course of his criminal career, Scarpa engaged in a wide variety of crimes, including burglary, loan sharking, illegal gambling, drug dealing, and murder. When asked by one of his criminal associates how many murders he had committed, Scarpa responded that he had stopped counting after he had reached fifty.
- 7. Defendant was a special agent of the F.B.I. From approximately 1978 to 1992, Scarpa paid defendant for information about the federal government's investigation of organized crime.
- 8. At the beginning of the relationship between Scarpa and defendant, Scarpa and defendant would speak by telephone and would agree to meet at a specific location. Defendant would drive to the location in one car and Scarpa's girlfriend, Linda Schiro, would drive Scarpa to the meeting in another car. Scarpa and defendant would then hold their meetings in either defendant's or Scarpa's car. However, after Scarpa and Linda Schiro moved into a house at 218 Avenue J in Brooklyn in 1978, defendant started meeting with Scarpa once or twice a week in Scarpa's house at 218 Avenue J. Once a week, Scarpa would give defendant a roll of bills that were bound together by a rubber

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 4 of 52

- band. When Scarpa and Schiro subsequently moved into a house at 1243 82nd Street in Brooklyn in 1986, defendant met with Scarpa in his house at 1243 82nd Street. Defendant and Scarpa met regularly at the house at 1243 82nd Street until 1991, the year when an internal war broke out in the Colombo crime family.
- 9. Defendant did not reveal to the F.B.I. his financial relationship with Scarpa. Instead, on July 1, 1980, defendant registered Scarpa as a confidential informant with the F.B.I. From 1980 until 1992, defendant served as Scarpa's official F.B.I. handler. But although Scarpa was registered as a confidential informant, Scarpa did not comply with the F.B.I. rules regarding confidential informants. A confidential informant for the F.B.I. is not permitted to participate in any prior written criminal activities, in the absence ο£ authorization from F.B.I. supervisors. During the period from 1980 to 1992, Scarpa continued to commit crimes, including burglary, loan sharking, illegal gambling, drug dealing, and murder, even though Scarpa never received authorization to commit any crimes.
- 10. Defendant was aware of Scarpa's criminal activities, but he did nothing to stop them. On the contrary, defendant helped Scarpa and his associates to commit crimes and to evade detection by law enforcement agents. In particular, defendant

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 5 of 52

aided Scarpa and others to kill Mary Bari, Joseph DeDomenico, Jr., Patrick Porco, and Lorenzo Lampasi.

The murder of Mary Bari

- 11. Mary Bari was the girlfriend of Alphonse Persico, the brother of Carmine Persico, the boss of the Colombo crime family. In September of 1984, Alphonse Persico was a fugitive from justice.
- 12. A few days before September 25, 1984, defendant met with Scarpa at Scarpa's home at 218 Avenue J in Brooklyn. Defendant informed Scarpa that Bari was speaking to federal law enforcement agents. Defendant expressed concern that Bari would tell the agents where Alphonse Persico could be found. Defendant told Scarpa that he had to take care of this problem. Scarpa told defendant not to worry and said that he (Scarpa) would take care of the matter.
- 13. On September 24, 1984, at about 6 or 7 p.m., in the Occasions bar at 6908 13th Avenue in Brooklyn, Scarpa, acting in concert with others, shot and killed Bari. Scarpa and his accomplices put Bari's body into the trunk of a car, drove to McDonald Avenue, and dumped Bari's body.
- 14. On September 25, 1984, at about 7 a.m., Police Officer William Fedele found the body of thirty-one-year-old Mary Bari

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 6 of 52

on the curb opposite 1247 McDonald Avenue. The cause of Bari's death was three gunshot wounds to the head.

15. Several days after September 25, 1984, defendant met with Scarpa again in Scarpa's home at 218 Avenue J. Scarpa described to defendant how he and his accomplices had killed Bari.

The murder of Joseph DeDomenico, Jr.

- 16. Joseph DeDomenico, Jr., was a member of Scarpa's "crew." As part of Scarpa's crew, DeDomenico committed a number of bank burglaries with Scarpa and others.
- 17. In 1985 or 1986, the relationship between Scarpa and DeDomenico began to deteriorate. Scarpa held DeDomenico responsible for a crime that had gone badly. Scarpa humiliated DeDomenico, by criticizing DeDomenico in front of others.
- 18. Sometime thereafter, DeDomenico formed his own crew. DeDomenico's crew committed a series of burglaries of jewelry stores and fur stores. Over the course of six months to a year, DeDomenico's crew made about a million dollars as a result of these burglaries. DeDomenico did not inform Scarpa of the existence of this crew or share the proceeds of the crimes with Scarpa.
- 19. In the early spring of 1986, defendant met with Scarpa at Scarpa's house on 218 Avenue J. Defendant told Scarpa about

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 7 of 52

the burglaries that DeDomenico had been committing behind Scarpa's back. Defendant also told Scarpa that DeDomenico had left his wife and was now with a woman who was a born-again Christian. Defendant said that he did not trust DeDomenico and that he was worried that DeDomenico might talk. Defendant told Scarpa that that they could not keep DeDomenico around and that Scarpa had to do something about him. Scarpa said that he would take care of it.

- 20. Scarpa told Lawrence Mazza, Scarpa's right-hand man and confidant, that they had to kill DeDomenico. Scarpa explained to Mazza that DeDomenico had become a born-again Christian and that being a born-again Christian was one step away from being a "rat."
- 21. Scarpa had a son named Gregory Scarpa, Jr. On or before September 17, 1987, Gregory Scarpa, Jr., acting in concert with others, shot and killed DeDomenico in a stolen car.
- 22. On September 17, 1987, at about 1:55 a.m., Police Officer Susan Scellato found the body of forty-four-year-old Joseph DeDomenico, Jr., in a car at 2065 72nd Street in Brooklyn. The cause of DeDomenico's death was multiple gunshot wounds to the head and body.

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 8 of 52

23. Sometime after the death of DeDomenico, defendant met with Scarpa, Sr., in Scarpa's home at 1243 82nd Street in Brooklyn. Scarpa told defendant about the murder of DeDomenico.

The murder of Patrick Porco

- 24. Scarpa had another son, named Joey Scarpa. Joey Scarpa's best friend was Patrick Porco.
- 25. On October 31, 1989, at about 11:40 p.m., in front of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church on 7223 15th Avenue in Brooklyn, Joey Scarpa, Patrick Porco, Reyes Aviles, and Craig Sobel, acting in concert, shot and killed seventeen-year-old Dominic Masseria.
- 26. In May of 1990, Porco spoke with detectives of the New York City Police Department and the Kings County District Attorney's Office about the death of Masseria.
- 27. In May of 1990, the telephone in Scarpa's home rang. Schiro picked up the telephone. Defendant was on the line. Defendant asked to speak to Scarpa. Schiro gave Scarpa the telephone. Scarpa was on the telephone for only a couple of seconds. Scarpa then hung up and told Schiro that they needed to go to a pay phone. Schiro drove Scarpa to a pay phone near Fort Hamilton Parkway and Tenth Avenue in Brooklyn.
- 28. Schiro stayed in the car while Scarpa called defendant. Scarpa spoke with defendant for five or ten minutes.

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 9 of 52

When Scarpa returned to the car, Scarpa told Schiro, "I can't believe this fucking kid. Patrick is going to rat on Joey. We got to do something about this." Scarpa and Schiro drove back to their house.

- 29. When they returned, Scarpa called his son Joey into the dining room. He told Joey that Porco was going to inform the authorities of Joey's role in the murder of Masseria.
- 30. On May 26 or May 27, 1990, Joey Scarpa and John Sinagra picked up Porco in a 1978 or 1979 Pontiac LeMans and drove to McDonald Avenue. On McDonald Avenue, Sinagra shot and killed Porco. Sinagra and Joey Scarpa then drove to another location and dumped Porco's body on the street.
- 31. On May 27, 1990, at about 5:39 a.m., Captain Lizette Scarfutto found the body of eighteen-year-old Patrick Porco at the corner of West First Street and Village Road South in Brooklyn. The cause of death was a gunshot wound to Porco's head.
- 32. Shortly after the death of Porco, defendant met with Scarpa at Scarpa's home at 1243 82nd Street. Scarpa told defendant that they had killed Porco. Scarpa said that his son Joey was upset about the killing of Porco and was very angry at Scarpa. Defendant told Scarpa that Joey would get over it when

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 10 of 52

he realized that, as a result of the shooting, he had avoided jail.

The murder of Lorenzo Lampasi

- 33. In 1991, a deadly internal war commenced within the Colombo crime family between two opposing factions: one faction was loyal to imprisoned boss Carmine Persico and the other faction was loyal to acting boss Victor A. Orena. Each faction organized "hit teams," which killed members of the opposing faction. Scarpa, who was part of the Persico faction, formed a hit team which killed people associated with the Orena faction.
- 34. On or about May 15, 1992, defendant met with Scarpa in Scarpa's home at 1243 82nd Street. Scarpa told defendant that he wanted to kill Lorenzo Lampasi, who was part of the Orena faction. Scarpa asked defendant for information on Lampasi, including the address where Lampasi was living and the time that Lampasi left his house for work in the morning. Defendant told Scarpa that he would get Scarpa the information.
- 35. Law enforcement agencies had conducted physical surveillance on Lampasi at his home at 210 Caton Avenue in Brooklyn. This surveillance showed that Lampasi left his home for work at about 4 a.m. There was a gate on Lampasi's driveway, which Lampasi had to open in order to drive his car

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 11 of 52

onto the street. Every morning, after Lampasi drove past the gate, Lampasi got out of his car to close and lock the gate.

- 36. On or about May 19 or May 20, 1992, defendant met with Scarpa in Scarpa's home at 1243 82nd Street. Defendant said that he had gotten the information Scarpa had wanted. Defendant gave Scarpa Lampasi's address and said that Lampasi left his home for work at 4 a.m. Defendant also told Scarpa about the gate on Lampasi's driveway. Defendant told Scarpa that Lampasi had to get out of his car to open and close the gate.
- 37. On or about May 21, 1992, Scarpa met with three members of his hit team, Lawrence Mazza, James Delmastro, and Larry Fiorenza, to plan the murder of Lampasi. Scarpa told the others that Lampasi left his home at 4 a.m.
- 38. On May 22, 1992, at about 2 a.m., Scarpa picked up Mazza and Delmastro in New Jersey. They drove to Lampasi's home at 210 Caton Avenue in Brooklyn. At about 4 a.m., Lampasi drove down his driveway past the gate. Lampasi got out of his car to close and lock the gate.
- 39. The car containing Scarpa, Mazza, and Delmastro pulled up to Lampasi. Scarpa shot Lampasi once with a rifle. Lampasi fell to the ground. Scarpa, Mazza, and Delmastro got out of their car and fired additional shots at Lampasi. Scarpa, Mazza, and Delmastro got back into their car and drove away.

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 12 of 52

- 40. On May 22, 1992, at about 4:25 a.m., in response to a radio run, Sergeant Guy Petersen and his partner drove to 210 Caton Avenue. Sergeant Peterson found the body of sixty-six-year-old Lorenzo Lampasi on the ground near Lampasi's car. The cause of Lampasi's death was gunshot wounds to the head.
- 41. At the time of the Colombo war, defendant was the supervisor of C-10, the F.B.I. squad assigned to investigate the Colombo and Bonnano crime families. One of defendant's subordinates, Special Agent Christopher Favo, was the case agent in charge of the F.B.I.'s investigation into the Colombo war. When Agent Favo was informed that Lampasi had been killed, he reported that fact to defendant. Defendant responded, "[W]e're gonna win this thing." Agent Favo reminded defendant that they were the F.B.I. and that the F.B.I. was not on either side of the Colombo war.
- 42. About a week or so after the death of Lampasi on May 22, 1992, defendant met with Scarpa in Scarpa's home on 82nd Street. Scarpa told defendant about the shooting of Lampasi.

The arrest of Scarpa

43. During the investigation of the Colombo war, Agent Favo obtained evidence connecting Scarpa to the murder of Nicholas Grancio and the shooting of Joel Cacace, two mobsters associated with the Orena faction. Agent Favo learned that

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 13 of 52

Scarpa was supposed to surrender himself to state authorities on a gun charge on August 31, 1992 and that Scarpa was expected to be released a few hours later.

- 44. Agent Favo obtained a warrant from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York to arrest Scarpa for conspiracy to commit murder. Although defendant was Favo's supervisor and Scarpa's handler, Agent Favo did not inform defendant of the arrest warrant until state officials had taken defendant into custody. Agent Favo and two other members of the C-10 squad who reported to defendant, Agent Jeffrey Thomlinson and Agent Ray Andjich, suspected that defendant had been providing confidential law enforcement information to Scarpa. Agent Favo, Agent Thomlinson, and Agent Andjich feared that if they told defendant of the federal arrest warrant before Scarpa surrendered himself, defendant would warn Scarpa and Scarpa would flee.
- 45. When Agent Favo told defendant of the federal arrest warrant for Scarpa, defendant got angry. Defendant attempted to call Scarpa, but defendant was unable to reach him.
 - 46. Scarpa died in prison in 1994.

The grand jury's decision

47. At the conclusion of the grand jury presentation, the prosecutor instructed the grand jury on New York law regarding

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 14 of 52

accessorial liability and intentional murder. The prosecutor told the grand jury that "when one person engages in conduct which constitutes an offense, another person is criminally liable for such conduct when, acting with the mental culpability required for the commission thereof, he solicits, requests, commands, importunes, or intentionally aids such person to engage in such conduct." See N.Y. Penal Law § 20.00. prosecutor also told the grand jury that a person is guilty of Murder in the Second Degree "when with intent [to] cause the death of another person, he causes the death of such person or a third person." See N.Y. Penal Law § 125.25(1). The prosecutor then submitted to the grand jury four counts of intentional murder: one count concerning the death of Mary Bari; one count concerning the death of Joseph DeDomenico, Jr.; one count concerning the death of Patrick Porco; and one count concerning the death of Lorenzo Lampasi. The grand jury returned a true bill on all counts.

48. On March 23, 2006, the grand jury filed Kings County Indictment Number 6825/2005, which charged defendant with four counts of Murder in the Second Degree (N.Y. Penal Law § 125.25[1]).

² New York's statute of limitations barred the prosecution of defendant for other state crimes. <u>See</u> N.Y. Crim. Proc. Law § 30.10.

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 15 of 52

State Court Proceedings

- 49. On March 30, 2006, defendant was arraigned on the indictment in the Supreme Court, Kings County, before Justice Gustin L. Reichbach. Defendant pled not guilty. The court set bail in the amount of \$100,000 cash bond and a \$900,000 surety. Because defendant does not live in New York State, the court ordered that, as a condition of his release on bail, defendant had to wear an electronic monitoring bracelet.
 - 50. Defendant was released on bail.

The Removal Petition

- 51. By petition dated April 7, 2006, defense counsel now moves to remove this state criminal prosecution to federal court pursuant to the federal officer removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1). In his petition, defendant contends that he is entitled to removal because he was acting under color of office at the time of the alleged crimes and because he has two colorable federal defenses: a Supremacy Clause immunity defense and a "Kastigar defense."
- 52. Defendant's petition for removal should be denied because he is not entitled to removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1). Defendant was not acting under color of office when he aided Gregory Scarpa, Sr., to kill Mary Bari, Joseph DeDomenico, Patrick Porco, and Lorenzo Lampasi. Furthermore,

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 16 of 52

defendant has no colorable federal defense. Defendant has no supremacy Clause immunity defense, because the murders of Bari, DeDomenico, Porco, and Lampasi were not necessary and proper to the performance of defendant's federal duties. Defendant has no colorable "Kastigar defense," because the Supreme Court's decision in Kastigar v. United States, 406 U.S. 441 (1972), did not create a defense to the crime of murder and because, in any event, defendant does have not a colorable Kastigar claim.

53. I am serving and filing with this answer affidavits from the five individuals who worked on this case: Assistant District Attorneys Noel Downey, Bryan Wallace, and Michael Vecchione, Detective Investigator Patrick Lanigan, and analyst Thomas Dades. These affidavits demonstrate that there is no basis for defendant's Kastigar claim because the People's evidence was not directly or indirectly derived from compelled statements made by defendant. In addition, I am serving on this Court, for its in camera review, the grand jury minutes.

Case 1:06-cr-00235-FB-CLP Document 4 Filed 05/24/2006 Page 17 of 52

For these reasons and for the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum of law, defendant's petition for removal should be denied.

Assistant District Attorney (718) 250-2464

Sworn to and subscribed before me

this 24th day of May, 2006

ROBERT W. HO

Notary Public, State of New York

No. 01HO6026162

Qualified in New York County

Commission Expires June 07, 20047